UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/559,142	12/01/2005	Moon-kyoon Chun	NEK-0015	9045
23413 CANTOR COL	7590 04/24/200 BURN, LLP	EXAMINER		
20 Church Stree		LISTVOYB, GREGORY		
22nd Floor Hartford, CT 06	5103	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1796	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/24/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/559,142	CHUN ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
GREGORY LISTVOYB	1796		

	GREGORY LISTVOYB	1796	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 09 April 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeler for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION, See MPEP 706.07(1)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth inter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of ext under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the s set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origin	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi AMENDMENTS	unin the time period set forth in 37 t	SFR 41.37(a).	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in beti	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	E below);	
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c			
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	21 See attached Nation of Nan Co.	maliant Amandmant (DTOL 224)
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 		npliant Amendment (i	F10L-324).
 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s). 		imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-9,11-19,21,23 and 24. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary 	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	l and/or appellant fail e 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	itry is below or attach	ed.
 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. 	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Pahan Saraant/		
	/Rabon Sergent/	nit 1796	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: 1. Applicant argues that the amount of less than 3% of homopolystyrene does not disclose by the References. The Examiner disagrees. Firstly, the presence of homopolymer inevitably leads to broadening MWD. In opposite Kurokawa's copolymer has a very narrow MWD (2-3), which suggests only copolymer present in the reaction mixture. Secondly, Kurokawa does not disclose any homopolymer present. The Applicant should prove his statement, providing experimental data, which shows the presence of homopolymer, performing synthesis at Kurokawa's conditions...2. Glass transition temperature depends on the ratio of different structural units in the copolymer. PS Homopolymer present most likely gives additional Tg at 106-110C. The lower Tg of copolymer can not be considered as an evidence of homopolymer presence. 3. Applicant argues that low residence time decreases probability of homopolymer formation. Since Kurokaw'a teaches continuous process, the residence time of his method is lower than one for a batch process, claiming by the Applicant . In addition, Oshida teaches separation and drying steps to remove volatiles (i.e. unreacted monomers), which decreases probability of homopolymer formation.4. Regarding monomer ratios,Oshida teaches the ratio of feeding rate of 5:1, which is within the arnge claimed.5. Regarding conversion of the monomers, Kurokawa teaches conversion of dicarboxylic anhydride monomer of 95% or greater (see line 0005). Regarding Applicant's argument that Oshida teaches only 65% of conversion (see line 0021), note that Oshida teaches continuous process. Typically, unreacted monomers recycling into reaction mixture .